

rejections for nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 10 on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for alleged anticipation by *Srinivasa* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0233385). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Srinivasa fails to anticipate Applicants claimed embodiments as alleged.

Namely, this document is directed to a heterogeneous computing environment that includes a number of servers in an enterprise's IT infrastructure that support multiple operating systems (Unix, Linux, Windows). In particular, distributed server change operations are performed in a transaction-safe manner. Server components may be interdependent across different servers, which is handled by enterprise system management tools.

Srinivasa discloses an embodiment in which a configuration manager selects servers and their respective configuration parameters to compare against a reference model. The comparison can be performed based on the software or server objects present on the respective servers. Discrepancies between the servers are identified and corrected by synchronizing the configuration of the servers with a reference model. Srinivasa, pgphs [0126], [0127].

Independent claims 1 and 8 are directed to a method and system, respectively, that validates a consistency of attributes of entities modeling a physical asset of a utility. The method of claim 1 comprises, among other features,

loading the entity to be validated for consistency of attributes of the entity into the buffer of the consistency service, wherein the physical asset carries the attributes of the entity

reading values of the attributes of the entity through the adapter of an IT system,

comparing, in the consistency service, the values of the attributes of the entity to values of reference attributes stored in the consistency service, and

storing consistency validating information in the output means, said consistency validating information depending on the results of the comparison of the values of the attributes to the values of the reference attributes.

Similarly, independent claim 8 recites, among other features:

a consistency service having:

an input buffer in which an entity to be validated for consistency of attributes of the entity can be placed, wherein the physical asset carries the attributes of the entity;

output means for storing a result of the consistency validation; and

communication means for communicating with the different IT systems,

wherein an adapter for each of the IT systems allows communication between the consistency service and the IT systems, and

wherein a reference storage holds references to the entities in the respective data sets of the various IT systems such that a specific entity in a specific IT system can be addressed through the adapter of the specific IT system and based on such a reference stored in the reference storage,

wherein the consistency service comprises means for comparing the values of the attributes of the specific entity to values of reference attributes stored in the consistency service, and

wherein the output means stores the consistency validating information depending on the results of the comparison of the values of the attributes to the values of the reference attributes.

In particular these claims encompasses features used for validating consistency of attributes of physical assets in utility operations, such as stations, lines, transformers, breakers, regions, and areas. Different IT systems execute respective applications to control, monitor, and manage various operational aspects of a utility. The respective applications use entities, which represent various

components or physical assets of the utility. Each entity has associated attributes, which are related to the physical asset the entity represents.

However, *Srinivasa* does not disclose a method that compares the attributes of entities that represent physical assets of a utility as recited in Applicants' claims. Rather, this reference discloses a system that compares the consistency of server objects among different servers on an IT network. For these reasons, claims 1 and 8 are distinguishable over the applied art of record.

Regarding claims 3-6, *Srinivasa* does not disclose or suggest "the consistency service sending a signal to verify the existence of a specific data set of an IT system to the IT system holding the entity to be validated for consistency of attributes of the entity prior to reading the values of the attributes of the entity through the adapter of the IT system" as is recited in the claim. Rather, *Srinivasa* discloses a technique in which snapshots of various server objects are taken. The snapshot including various values, such as file names, sizes, permissions, directory locations, etc. (pgph [0115]). The snapshot is taken of servers a user desires to browse, or the objects within a server can be identified through a server template (pgph [0114]).

Thus, because the server from which server objects are obtained is known before the snapshot is taken or based on the information obtained from the snapshot, *Srinivasa* does not disclose or suggest a need for verifying the existence of a specific data set of an IT system to the IT system holding the entity to be validated for consistency of attributes of the entity prior to reading the values of the attributes of the entity through the adapter of the IT system". This process step is performed in relation to Applicants' claimed embodiment to determine whether the entity in the input buffer actually exists within a respective IT system.

For the reasons discussed in detail above, claims 1 and 3-9 are distinguishable over *Srinivasa* and not anticipated as alleged. Withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 12 on page 13 of the Office Action, claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over *Srinivasa*, and further in view of *Millet* (U.S. Patent No. 7,739,359). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively. By virtue of this dependency, and because of the additional features recited therein, these claims are deemed patentably distinct from the combined documents. Namely, *Millet* fails to remedy the above-identified deficiencies of *Srinivasa* with respect to independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-10 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 26, 2011

By: /Shawn B. Cage/
Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620